Earl Browder Reveals His Past Relations With Dewey and Taft, Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. II, NUMBER 37 OCTOBER 18, 1954 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Ike Puts Chiang on That Leash Again

In Washington steps toward peace are taken surreptitiously, as if slightly obscene. The Eisenhower Administration has just reinstated, temporarily at least, the Truman Administration policy on Formosa. Chiang's bombing attacks on the Chinese mainland have suddenly been called off on orders from Washington. The Republicans, though campaigning as the peace party, seem afraid to take credit for what they have done. The Democrats, though they attack the Republicans for recklessness in foreign policy, seem equally afraid to boast that Eisenhower has been forced to reinstate Truman policy.

Frustrated, Formosa has opened an attack on Washington instead. The news that the bombings were being called off was "leaked" from Taipeh and dressed up, in smart propagandistic fashion, with talk that the U.S. was creating another "privileged sanctuary." Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, so sick with ulcers that he was forbidden by his doctor to attend the Manila conference, flew off to Formosa with two top aides secretly last Friday night a week. His departure was not announced until the following Monday just about the time he arrived in Formosa. The head of the State Department's "China desk" and the latter's opposite number in the Foreign Operations Administration accompanied Robertson. The presence of the FOA man indicates that Chiang may be mollified with promises of additional aid. No great Power was ever so afraid of its own satellite.

Jenner Picks Up from McCarthy

The first bomb dropped on Washington by the Chinese Nationalists was a blast by Jenner. The Senate's No. 1 witch hunter (now that McCarran is dead and McCarthy in dry-dock) declared that there had been "a mysterious meeting of the National Security Council in Denver on the question of defending Quemoy" and asked in his best hobgoblin fashion, "Did someone in our government send word to Red China, that the United States would *not* defend these stepping stones to Formosa, as someone sent word to Red China in 1950 that we would not attack the Red Chinese if they went into the war against us in Korea?" The latter, the pumped up myth of the MacArthurites, is stated as fact. Jenner went on to as paranoid a charge as has yet been heard even in this haunted capital.

If this were anyone else but an important Republican Senator, chairman of the Internal Security subcommittee, it could be ignored as crackpot. But here it is, in Jenner's own words: "I have been told that the Red attack on Quemoy and the other islands is part of a secret plan to let Nationalists expend their ammunition in heavy firing against the mainland. Then someone in the American government will forget to replenish the equipment and ammunition, or will replenish everything except one or two vital components. *There is no way to substantiate such a charge.* But remember—the heaviest tanks or the newest jet bombers can be quietly sabotaged by lack of a few parts. *Our only danger will come from moves so delicate that they cannot be seen or heard.*" This fear of the impalpable has the flavor of old Salem.

Clears Ike of Treason

In demanding that the President "tell the American people, immediately, what individual, in what agency, made such a decision," Jenner was threatening to take up where McCarthy left off. "Of course," Jenner said, generously, "I know that President Eisenhower, Secretary Wilson and the Joint Chiefs of Staff would have no smallest part in any such treasonable deception." But below them? "Our military policy is not made by our military leaders . . . It is made by a network of boards and agencies. They weave a spider-web of laws and directives . . . All these spider-web connections are meshed into the UN Charter . . . A few men in our government can tie the whole military program of the U.S. into knots . . . in the dark weighting down every bullet with UN's policy." In addition to holding back Chiang, they have—according to Jenner—limited Rhee's ammunition to a two-day supply, lest he "defend himself."

Fortunately (perhaps because it was not published in their Bible, *The Daily Worker*) no one on the staff of his Internal Security subcommittee tipped Jenner off that Americans for Democratic Action only a few days earlier issued a statement demanding that the Administration "refer the fighting in the Formosa straits to the UN with the object of obtaining an immediate cease-fire." Had they done so, he might have tied Ike directly to the ADA. Its anti-Communism would not fool him. On October 6 Jenner told a meeting in Columbus, "The really dangerous Communists in this country look like Germany's Dr. John *before* he was found out . . . employes in the executive branch will never catch the really big fish—the 'anti-Communist' leaders who are working high in our government to destroy us."

The only safety, Jenner told his Ohio audience, was in "vigorous, continuous investigation by Congress." This is the man who opened the campaign which finally destroyed General Marshall's usefulness. If Jenner could destroy Marshall, he could destroy the conservative business men like Wilson and Humphrey and the lesser military men who have opposed Admiral Radford and the adventurers in the Joint Chiefs of Staff. These ravings are serious. Until such statesmen are retired to the booby-hatch, and Chiang's infiltration of Washington ended, peace will not be secure.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An Indispensable Document in Fighting Loyalty and Security Cases

Earl Browder Reveals That in the 30's Dewey and Taft, Too . . .

By Earl Browder

The closing days of the 83rd Congress showed Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals, competing wildly for the honors of sponsoring the most extreme anti-Communist legislation. Coming on top of the Oppenheimer decision, which declared our leading atomic scientist a "security risk" because of associations with Communists during the late '30s and early '40s, this seems to leave no doubt that the American Communist Party is, even if in an indirect and distorted way, the dominant issue in American politics this year.

Now it just happens that I was one of the principal leaders of the American Communist Party for a quarter of a century (1921-1945), was its chief spokesman for twelve years (1934-1945), and was its candidate for President in 1936 and 1940.

I am not a Communist now. I broke my relations with the Party in 1945, when it made a big change in policy which I could not accept. The Communists say they kicked me out, which is accurate enough for practical purposes; my books are outlawed among the Communists, and in their purge trials behind the Iron Curtain men have been hung for confessing their possession. It is one of those weird items that make the post-war world seem like a madhouse that the Communists say the American State Department published my books in Europe to subvert their governments, while Senator McCarthy uses the same books as evidence of Communist subversion in the State Department. Thus I am on the blacklist in both Moscow and Washington.

Before The Cold War

It was not always so. For years I was a welcome visitor in both these cities, and treated with great respect; I was one of the channels of cooperation between these two centers of the communist and and capitalist worlds. That was in the old days before the Cold War, when both sides seemed to want to make friends instead of denouncing each other at the top of their voices.

It is, of course, quite true that there was a great deal of cooperative relations between the American Communists and people in public life, Democrats and Republicans, over the years of the Roosevelt Administration. It is also true that the Communists, in the main, supported Roosevelt and his policies, and that their help was welcomed and sought by the Roosevelt camp.

What is difficult for most people to remember today, when the terms "Communist" and "outlaw" have become identical in the public mind and Communists are hunted down like rabbits, is that this is something new, that for some 12 years the Communists were "respectable" collaborators in public life, "just another political party" as the saying goes, even if a bit unorthodox and peculiar. Yet precisely that fact needs to be remembered now, if our nation is to keep its balance, keep its sense of historical perspective, and not become hysterical.

Today the climate of public opinion outlaws the slightest association with Communists, and this is being enforced by more and more Draconian laws. But only a few yesterdays ago the climate of public opinion was quite otherwise. This fact may be illustrated by a relatively unimportant incident:

When Dewey Asked for Help

In 1937 an ambitious and able young Republican named Thomas E. Dewey made his first election campaign for the position of District Attorney of New York County, traditionally strongly Democratic. His organization felt the need to gather votes wherever they were to be found, and solicited Communist support. The issue came to me, and I said, of course, support Dewey. This was done through a Trade Union Committee, headed by a well-known Communist named Louis Weinstock. When Dewey won the election that Committee gave him a "victory banquet," at which he was photographed arm-in-arm with the toastmaster, Weinstock.

Of course, Dewey was as innocent in this association as Oppenheimer was in his which began about the same time, though the motive was different. It was a political marriage without love on either side, purely one of expediency. Dewey got his office, and the Communists got some racketeer enemies cleaned out of the New York Painters and the Food Workers Unions, which enabled us, together with our allies, to lead these unions for the next eight years.

We might equally well illustrate this climate of public opinion favorable to Communist participation in public life from 1934 to 1945, by another incident equally unimportant in itself. Today the Attorney General's list of "subversive organizations," association with which in the past may cause any worker to lose his job in defense industry, or any scientist to be placed "before a blank wall," is the name of the American Youth Congress.

In 1938 this organization held its annual national get-together in Cleveland, in the municipal auditorium, with a great mass meeting to open the proceedings, at which I, the General Secretary of the Communist Party, was advertised as a featured speaker. It was in the midst of the congressional election campaign and Robert A. Taft was then running for the Senate for the first time. His campaign manager, Charles Taft, approached the Youth Congress officials and asked that Robert be invited to address the same mass meeting; the answer was that, of course, he would be invited if assurance was given that he would not object to speaking on the same platform with Browder. That assurance was given, and Taft and I both spoke, being photographed grinning at each other in a most brotherly fashion.

What a far cry this was from 1950, when Millard Tydings

Explanatory Note—A Case of Informing In Reverse

For many years the government has been bringing pressure on Earl Browder, once head of the American Communist party, to turn him into an informer. As readers of the Weekly know (see Vol. I, No. 8, "The Man Who Refused to Be a Budenz" and Vol. II, No. 26, "Memo to the New York Times and the Alsops"), a perjury indictment was obtained against Browder and his wife by Roy Cohn when the latter was in the U.S. Attorney's office in New York, and then word sent Browder that all would be well if only he would "cooperate" with the government. Mrs. Browder's illness prevented the case from being tried, but the indictment has since been severed and Browder will soon face trial alone on a trumped-up charge arising out of Mrs. Browder's application for citizenship eight years ago.

In this article, Browder finally "informs"—but not the way Roy Cohn wanted it. He "informs" on Dewey and Taft to illustrate the different atmosphere which existed in this country in the 30's and early 40's—and to criticize current "security" standards. For a hounded man, with no organizational support, treated as a pariah by the Communists and with suspicion by the anti-Communists, it took great courage to write this article. Magazines which would have been happy to buy a different kind of "memoirs" from Browder turned this down, and he sent it to the Weekly in desperation. We are happy to print it. We believe it is useful ammunition for loyalty and security proceedings. And we take the unusual step of suggesting that those readers who like it, and appreciate what it represents, can help Browder fight his case by making a contribution and sending it to him direct at his home, 7 Highland Place, Yonkers, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Scientists, Government Workers and Writers Now Blacklisted for Much Less

. . . Asked For, and Obtained, Support from the Communist Party

was defeated for the Senate by a faked photograph ostensibly showing him in my company, a photo manufactured from two separate pictures by, so I am told, Mr. Don Surine of Senator McCarthy's staff! But today any scientist who was so unfortunate as to be a youth in 1938, and was caught in that photo with Robert A. Taft, would have a long and rough path to a security clearance.

Another name on the Attorney General's "subversive list" is the League of American Writers. At its 1937 convention opening in Carnegie Hall, New York City, featured speakers included the famous novelist Ernest Hemingway, the poet and later Librarian of Congress, Archibald MacLeish, and the then Communist Earl Browder. Presumably it was my presence on this program which later, *after the organization had been dissolved*, caused the Attorney General to list it as subversive. But it was fully in the spirit of its times, the spirit which in the same year brought Tom Dewey into active collaboration with the Communists and which the next year brought Taft and myself onto the same platform. But how many young writers whose names were listed as members have been harried out of public and private employment in these later years for following their example!

FDR, Willkie and Browder

Still another name on the "subversive list" is "The Committee to Free Earl Browder." I had gotten into trouble with the Roosevelt Administration when the Second World War broke out. Roosevelt had welcomed our previous attacks against isolationism, and was quite angry when we changed after the Soviet-Nazi Pact. Therefore he gave the green light to members of his cabinet who demanded that I be punished for the change. As a result I was arrested on an old passport case dug out of the archives of the Hoover Administration, which never before seemed important enough to prosecute, and sentenced to four years in prison. Wendell Willkie won the Republican presidential nomination in 1940 in a campaign which opened with an article in which, among other things, he criticized Roosevelt for sending me to prison for my ideas while pretending it was for my acts. The government itself admitted before the Supreme Court that my supposed "crime" was one of those "acts not in themselves wrong," that it did not injure any person or the government, that it "did not involve moral turpitude," and that it "must be construed as having no implication of evil purpose."

After Pearl Harbor one of my friends went to Roosevelt to ask him to order my release from prison. Roosevelt answered that he was very angry with his aids for the kind of case they had made against me, but that he was surrounded by enemies even in his own administration and, therefore, could not be in a position of interfering with a judgment of a court without good reason in public policy. He said it was necessary for Browder's friends to make the case for his release by public agitation and enlightenment on the ground of advancing thereby the nation's war effort. When that was done he could and would act.

As a result of President Roosevelt's words, the Committee to Free Earl Browder was formed, issued millions of leaflets, published full-page advertisements in two dozen of the country's leading newspapers, and held a national conference in Madison Square Garden, New York City, with thousands of delegates from labor unions and men in public life attending. Over 9,000 seamen on the Atlantic Convoys signed petitions for my release. When these results were placed in Roosevelt's hands, he ordered my release from prison as an act to help consolidate American national unity. He chose the time for his action under the advice of Mayor LaGuardia of New York City and Senator Elbert Thomas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, as these men informed me personally later and as I learned from other sources. The Committee to Free Earl Browder existed for less than six months, its aims had been endorsed by the Republican presidential candidate, by the chairman of the most important Senate Committee, and by the Mayor of America's largest city. Then it had been acted on by the President, granting its request. But years later, the security files of the U.S. Government are filled with accusations against individuals based on their association with that Committee, which is accepted as one of the marks of a "security risk."

The League Against War and Fascism

Another organization on today's "subversive list" is the American League for Peace and Democracy, one of those named subversive long after it was dissolved, not when it was active. Congressman Dies recently testified that it had six or seven million members and that nearly every Cabinet member during the Roosevelt Administration, at one time or another, spoke under its auspices, gave letters of endorsement and other expressions of encouragement to it. Mr. Dies overestimates its real membership, which never went much above five million, but he does not exaggerate its influence which reached the majority of the country at its peak, and its lists of speakers and sponsors look like a cross-section from Who's Who in America. I was a national vice-president of the American League until its dissolution at the end of 1939; this, presumably, is taken as justification for naming it as "subversive" long after it went out of business. Thereby five million people (or seven or eight million, if Mr. Dies' figures are accepted) are on the list of "security suspects."

Up until after 1945, it is simply an inescapable fact of life that not even the Communist Party itself was considered in the broad circles of public opinion as "subversive." This is shown by one little incident:

On February 18, 1945, a telegram was delivered to me in my office at Communist Party headquarters, which began: "The American Bar Association wishes to invite you to participate in its new radio discussion program, 'Let's Face the Issue', Sunday, March Four from New York on the topic, 'Should a World League Permit a Nation to Veto Sanctions Against Itself?'" It went on to say that my fellow participant probably would be Senator Jos. Ball, Sen. Fulbright, or Philip Jessup of Columbia University.

Did Not Think of Themselves as Subversive

I can add from my own knowledge that the great majority of Communist Party members did not consider their tasks as subversion, and if there was then a minority of a different mind, they had to keep their opinions secret or face expulsion from the Party.

I speak of the Communist Party only as I knew it from being its principal leader until 1945. In that year the Party suddenly changed its policy, following an intervention ostensibly coming from French Communist leaders. I opposed that change, and warned that it would cut the roots of the Party in American society and isolate it. I was expelled from the Party for this open declaration of opposition and have had no connection with it since then. Events since that time have fully borne out my judgment. The vast majority of its members soon left it, and it lost all serious national influence.

What happened after 1945 is another story. Events have proved that the Communist Party's break with the policies I had given it was one of the first steps toward the Cold War which I had foreseen as a possibility and had done everything in my power to prevent, considering it a catastrophe for every nation involved. I hold no brief for the later actions of the Communist Party. But its stupid policies have so isolated it as to destroy any capacity it might conceivably have for serious harm, except in its role as a spectre to frighten the timid bourgeois into hysterics. The current uproar about "outlawing" the Communist Party is a vulgar comedy unworthy of a serious self-respecting and powerful nation. And the confusion worse confounded as to who and what should be considered "subversive" is the greatest internal menace to our national sanity.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Weird Question Posed by the New Lattimore Indictment:

Can A Man's Opinion of His Own Opinions Be Perjury?

Washington—Legal opinion here seems agreed that the new indictment obtained by the government against Owen Lattimore is likely to fare more poorly in the courts than its predecessor. The two new counts merely restate in new form the old Count I which Federal District Judge Youngdahl threw out, and on which he was upheld 8-to-1 in the Circuit Court of Appeals.

The old Count I said Lattimore lied in saying that he had "never been a sympathizer or any other kind of promotor of . . . Communist interests." The Circuit Court ruled that "even if 'promotor' were a perfectly certain term (which we do not decide), the presence of the uncertain word ["sympathizer"] is sufficient to destroy the count."

This was the heart of the indictment. The Government could have appealed. When reporters asked the Solicitor General's office last August why the decision was not being appealed, the answer was to "draw your own conclusions." The *Washington Post* in an editorial (Aug. 21) commented, "The conclusion which we draw is that the Solicitor General felt that he could not in good conscience defend an indictment which should never have been brought." This analysis was privately confirmed, lifting the curtain for one peep into the biggest behind-scenes story of all—the fact that Solicitor General Sobeloff to his credit was unwilling to appeal the decision because he agreed with it.

Doesn't The Government Believe Budenz?

The alternative was to bring in a new indictment. The obvious move was to indict Lattimore for denying under oath what Budenz had sworn—that he had "heard" Lattimore referred to in party circles as a Communist. Budenz was summoned before the new grand jury, but no such count was forthcoming. Either the government does not trust its own star witness, Budenz, or Budenz is unwilling to say under cross-examination what was only wrung from him reluctantly before the McCarran committee.

Instead of thus boldly taking the heart of its case into court for trial, the government did a flimsy rewrite of Count I. It created one new count by taking out the word "sympathizer" from the old Count I and leaving in "promotor."

Then it created another new count by doing what it had been refused the right to do in the courts. The Circuit Court said "the vagueness" of the old Count I "cannot be cured by a bill of particulars." What the new Count I does is to present a bill of particulars but to change the allegation from "sympathizer" to "follower of the Communist line." This will be challenged as equally vague in a new motion to dismiss, which should be argued before the same District Judge, Youngdahl, unless the government changes the rules in an effort to get Lattimore. (See note on Page 5)

The Only Safety Lies In Following Party Line Counter Clockwise

"This indictment lays bare the fact that this prosecution is a direct and immediate threat to anyone and everyone who has ever written or spoken on foreign affairs and whom the government chooses to attack for political reasons . . . Under this indictment, no writer on foreign affairs could be safe from prosecution unless during the past 20 years he had always opposed everything that Russia advocated."

—Owen Lattimore, on his new indictment.

Heresy, Not Perjury

The indictment does not allege that Lattimore obeyed party directives, or was part of some conspiracy to carry out party policy. It merely says that he lied when he denied that he "was or ever had been a follower of the Communist line." This is a matter of opinion, and in this case of Lattimore's opinion of his own past opinions. This is a long way from those questions of fact and materiality on which ordinary perjury trials depend. Can a man's opinion of his own opinions be perjury?

The trial will indeed be an old-fashioned heresy proceeding in which words and phrases will be torn from voluminous writings to prove suspect views. An example: under Topic 2, Lattimore is accused of upholding the thesis that "The Soviet Union is democratic." But the passage cited to support this does not deal with internal policy in the Soviet Union. The passage cited is a 1938 review of Chinese, Japanese and Soviet press opinion of Japanese aggression against China in which the statement is made that *by contrast with the Japanese press*, the Soviet on this topic is "robustly democratic," showing "fervent sympathy for China." This is misplitting a very far fetched hair.

Those Nice Little German Playmates We Are About To Rearm

The September 24 issue of *The* (London) *Times* Literary Supplement prints a startling document. It is to be found in a review of autobiographies published in Germany by the economist M. J. Bonn and the Protestant theologian F. W. Foerster. Foerster writes in his "*Erlebte Weltgeschichte*" that whenever he reads Hitler or some pan-German text he can "only say that there are two totally different kinds of brain in the German people, so different that one can hardly believe them to belong to the same folk—the Leibnitz-Bach-Goethe brain and the Ludendorff-Haushofer-Hitler brain." Foerster says that the relationship between them "is that the Leibnitz-Bach-Goethe German always capitulates to the barbarians."

Foerster praises Adenauer highly, but fears a new capitulation of this kind may follow him. He sees the danger of a new "Leadership" in the Haushofer geopolitical school, which now has its center in Madrid. Foerster quotes a memorandum it issued in 1951 "and distributed to all influential quarters in Germany." This is the quotation:

"The present task of German policy can only be to regain full sovereignty and then, step by step, in the interest of all, to free Europe from American control . . .

"The policy hitherto followed of working with the West has become senseless. But for a long time to come a purposeful policy of neutrality, combined with a policy of working closely together with the East, would be entirely preferable to a one-sided Russian orientation.

"All our leaders who knew what they were doing always recommended close cooperation with Russia—Frederick the Great, Baron vom Stein, Bismarck, von Seeckt, Count Brockdorff-Rantzau—and, in the past thirty years, all our geopoliticians.

"At the end of 1940 Hitler thought he was bound to break with this pro-Russian tradition because he needed the inexhaustible eastern supplies of raw material for a final reckoning with the Anglo-American power . . .

"Our present task must be to repair that blunder. In any event we must cease to be impressed by the stupid American talk of the 'Fight of Democracy Against Communism . . .' What Germany needs in future in not democracy.

"On the contrary she needs the development of an authoritative state power, like that of Soviet Russia, that will permit the military and political elite in Germany to concentrate the industrial potency of the world of Europe, and to use the military strength of the German people in the interest of the rebirth of the Nation and the revival of Europe as the power-center of the whole world."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes In Defense of Charlie Wilson and other Underdogs

A lot of Generals at the Pentagon would be happy if Wilson's "dog" remark led to his resignation. A blunt and honest old shop foreman, Wilson has been quite unawed by brass. His remark about kennel dogs did reflect the self-made man's contempt for those with less git-up-and-git. But what he had to say was taken out of context, which was that defense was not to be treated as "just something to dish out to keep somebody busy." Far worse than anything to be read into Wilson's remark is the way the labor leaders of this country take war and "war work" for granted as a way of maintaining employment. Wilson has been a force for peace in this capital, and that's more than can be said for the bloodthirsty Meany or the equivocal Reuther . . .

A judge who rules against the government is ipso facto biased. This seems to be the government's position in the motion asking Judge Youngdahl to disqualify himself for "prejudice" in the Lattimore case. Since the Judge was upheld 8-to-1 on the main count, and lost 5-4 on minor ones in the Circuit Court of Appeals, presumably the eight judges who supported him are biased, too. Having failed so far to convict Lattimore, Brownell would like to convict his judges.

Footnote on Those New Security Risk Figures: One of the top assistants to Bryant W. Bowles, the ex-Marine sergeant who is president of the National Association for the Advancement of White People, is Joseph Mifflin Danes, of Hartley, Del., an employe in Washington of the Navy Department. He was one of the three original incorporators of the hate association and is its vice-president for Delaware. Asked whether he was not afraid that his activities might get him fired as subversive, Danes replied "Not in the least."

As important as the Trieste settlement "normalizing" the relations between Italy and Yugoslavia is the little noticed normalization of relations between Moscow and Tito. In both cases nationalism has triumphed. In the former, Italian and Yugoslav nationalism triumphed over economic good sense: Trieste will wither away again as an Italian port, and can thrive only as a free port for Central and Eastern Europe (much as it did under the Hapsburgs). In the latter, nationalism triumphed over communism. On September 22, *Pravda* printed a long excerpt respectfully headed "Declarations by the President of Yugoslavia," the first such coverage since 1948 when Tito was cast into outer darkness as a "Fascist." Trade and diplomatic relations have been restored between Yugoslavia and the whole Soviet bloc. If Moscow is willing to co-exist with its own arch heretic, it will co-exist with anybody. Query: Will Moscow now be less draconian in dealing with East European "little Tito's"? Will it some day learn what years of imperial experience have taught the British—how to hold the reins of power lightly . . .

It is impossible fully to assess the meaning of the new Russo-Chinese accords but the setting and circumstances certainly demonstrate what Washington is so loathe to believe—the fact that China is no mere East European satellite of Moscow. Whether Dairen as well as Port Arthur is being given up by the Russians is yet to be answered. What worries the State Department most is the joint call for a new conference to unify Korea. The well-informed Constantine Brown reports in his column in the *Washington Star* last Wednesday that it is feared the Communists may agree to free elections under international supervision, and that a formal peace in Korea would make it impossible (1) to keep Peiping out of the UN and (2) to maintain the 7th Fleet in the Formosa straits. How the State Department misses Stalin! His intransigence kept everything in such nice, comfortable deep freeze.

The Late Mr. Justice Jackson As Best Remembered

"Struggle to coerce uniformity of sentiment in support of some end thought essential to their time and country have been waged by many good men as well as evil men . . . Those who begin coercive elimination of dissent soon find themselves exterminating dissenters. Compulsory unification of opinion achieves only the unanimity of the graveyard . . .

"We can have intellectual individualism and the rich cultural diversity that we owe to exceptional minds only at the expense of occasional eccentricities and abnormal attitudes . . . But freedom to differ is not limited to things that do not matter much. That would be a mere shadow of freedom. The test of its substance is the right to differ as to things that touch the heart of the existing order.

"If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion or other matters of opinion or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein."

—Justice Jackson in the W. Va. Jehovah's Witnesses Flag Salute Case, 319 U.S. 624 (1943).

A Fondness for Beef Stroganoff Figures in Deportation

During the course of a pending deportation proceeding, the Immigration Service called a witness in support of its charge that the alien advocates world communism. Following are the subjects covered by the witness, who had met the alien just once:

Football:

The witness testified that the alien had expressed a preference for soccer over American football. On cross-examination, the following testimony was given:

"Q. Now, did you interpret his opposition to American football as an insult to America?

"A. Well—as an insult to this country?

"Q. Yes.

"A. Certainly, it's not in line with the thinking of myself and other Americans."

Refrigerators:

"Q. Let me get it straight. They were against capitalism and they were down on this country. Is that it?

"A. They made sarcastic remarks about the United States.

"Q. OK now. What were these sarcastic remarks which they made? State one sarcastic remark.

"A. Well, it was not in keeping to say they don't believe in refrigerators and those other items.

Beef Strogonoff:

"Q. Are you able to recall what was served for dinner?

"A. Yes, I was. I believe . . . X and his wife told me what they would have for dinner. She said it was beef Strogonoff. Don't ask me how to spell it. . . . I meant to say too that Mr. X either when we were served or when we were eating it, he made mention of the fact that this was a favorite dish of Mao, as I recall. It might be Mel or Mao, as I say I recall it was Mao."

Russian Easter:

"Q. When X said that they celebrated Russian Easter and thought it was much better than Christmas, did you think that she meant that *Communist* Easter was much better than Christmas? Is that what you thought?

"A. I would say probably yes.

"Q. You would say probably yes.

"A. Yes. I have never heard of Russian Easter before."

—American Civil Liberties Union-News (San Francisco), Oct. '54

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Way Around the Stale Russo-American Veto-and-Inspection Controversy

A Practical — and Therefore Disregarded — Proposal on The H-Bomb

When Vannevar Bush appeared before the Gray board in the Oppenheimer case, he was asked (p. 562) if he had tried to get the American government to postpone its first H-bomb test.

"I felt strongly," the famous scientist admitted, "that that test ended the possibility of the only type of agreement that I thought was possible with Russia at that time, namely, an agreement to make no more tests."

Dr. Bush explained that since it was possible to detect A and H bomb explosions anywhere in the world, "that kind of an agreement would have been self-policing in the sense that if it was violated, the violation would be immediately known."

"I still think," Dr. Bush told the Gray board, "that we made a grave error in conducting that test at that time, and not attempting to make that type of simple agreement with Russia. I think history will show that was a turning point that when we entered into the grim world that we are entering now, that those who pushed that thing through to a conclusion without making that attempt have a great deal to answer for."

Exploding Our H Bomb Helped the Russians

So far as I know no one has called attention to this passage in the voluminous testimony nor to the fact it discloses that at one point in the history of the H-bomb the new monster might have been curbed in a way which would have cut around the Russo-American controversy about effective inspection and the veto power.

Nor has anyone dwelt on two other points made by Dr. Bush in support of his position. One was (p. 563) that the explosion of an American H-bomb would at once enable the Russians to learn (through radiation detection) a good deal about how we made that bomb.

The other point made by Dr. Bush remains as terribly revelant today. "To us," the scientist testified (pps. 564-5), "with 500 KT fission [Atom] bombs we have very little need for a 10 megaton hydrogen bomb. The Russians, on the other hand, have the great targets of New York and Chicago . . . It is of enormous advantage to them."

In other words, of the two contending great Powers, the one which has the biggest cities and the most highly developed industrial system, is the one more vulnerable to the bigger bombs and has most to gain by stopping the race toward bigger and "better" varieties.

The Burmese Now Make a Similar Proposal

A similar proposal to which little attention has been paid by either the Americans or the Russians was put before the General Assembly on October 1 by James Barrington, the chief delegate of Burma. It is worth reprinting in his own words.

"I would like to refer," Mr. Barrington said, "to a matter on which it should be possible to reach agreement despite the cold war. This is the question of the cessation of all further experiments designed to produce bigger and better thermo-nuclear and atomic weapons. If what we read in the newspapers is correct, the type of hydrogen bomb already in existence has sufficient potency to extinguish life on this globe.

"To continue the search for more powerful types," the Burmese delegate observed, "would in the circumstances seem to us to be particularly senseless. Such experiments would only add greatly to the existing tensions, thereby bringing nearer the day when these weapons of mass destruction might be brought into use.

"One of the principal obstacles to an agreement on disarmament has been the difficulties inherent in inspection and control. In regard to new experiments with atomic and thermo-nuclear devices, however, it seems that this difficulty does not exist since all atomic and hydrogen bomb explosions can be readily detected. *Any violaton of an agreement to stop further experiments would therefore become known at once.*"

A Focal Point for Useful Discussion

Here is a way at least to ease tension by stopping any further tests of bigger bombs. We will return to it in future issues of the *Weekly*, believing that the unnoticed Bush testimony and the little noticed Burmese suggestion offer a constructive approach. This way something might be achieved before the new Russian inspection proposals are buried in another round of the stale and perhaps unresolvable inspection-and-veto controversy between Washington and Moscow.

Let Us Send A Sample Copy of This Issue Free To A Friend

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name.....

Street.....

City..... Zone..... State.....

Enter this gift sub for $4 more (money enclosed):

(To) Name.....

Street.....

City..... Zone..... State.....

10/18/54

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S.E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED